

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-20 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 over Buckley et al. Claim 5, 10, and 17 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 over Buckley et al in view of Kupka et al.

The independent claims 1, 6 and 13 have been amended to emphasize distinctions over Buckley as discussed below.

Buckley et al discloses a general purpose computer 100 (see FIG. 2) which generates print data employing a plurality of printer drivers (col 7, line 33) stored in the printer driver memory portion 134 of the computer memory 130. Buckley et al discloses that the rendering options to be used to render a particular document are selected by the user (col 2, lines 42 and 44, 52) through an input device 150 by selecting a virtual printer appropriate to the desired rendering options (see col 2, lines 40-45). The user interface (see FIG. 1) disclosed by Buckley et al is rendered by the general purpose computer 100 to a display device 160. The general purpose computer 100 (see FIG. 2) is not a printer nor is it a print server. The general purpose computer 100 is distinct from the printer 310 and print server 200 (col 6 line 1-4). Buckley et al does not disclose or suggest that the printer 310 or the print server 200 or the display device 160 renders documents with different sets of rendering parameters.

Buckley et al suggests that if content to be rendered is composed of several distinct image objects (graphics, text and photographic images, for example) or document types, the user may select a set of rendering options provided by the user interface (see FIG. 1) contained in a printer driver (see FIG. 2, 134) stored in memory portion (136, 138, 130) of the general purpose computer 100, the set of rendering options being associated with different virtual printers (col 2, lines 39-42) and thus being device dependent parameters. As an example, the described UI for the multiple printer drivers must first be installed in the general purpose computer 100. Applicant's FIG. 1A (prior art) corresponds broadly to the disclosure of Buckley et al. The information apparatus of the applicant corresponds broadly to Buckley et al's disclosure of a general purpose computer 100.

In view of the above, independent claims 1, 6 and 13 have been amended to emphasize that the information apparatus is a distinct device from the output device.

Claim 1 has been further amended to emphasize that the one or more components is (are) not previously stored or installed in the output device. Buckley et al does not disclose or suggest receiving over the communication channel one or more components associated with the output device and over the communication channel between the general purpose computer 100 and the printer 300 or the general purpose computer 100 and the print server 200. In Buckley et al, each virtual printer or its associated printer model is pre-installed, and stored in the general purpose computer 100 in memory portion 130 (col 7, line 4-15). They are not obtained or retrieved from the local area network (FIG. 2, 210), from the print server (FIG. 2, 200) or from the printer ((FIG. 2, 300, 310). Furthermore, in Buckley et al the selection step of the printer model that contains the device specific parameters is based on user input and selection (Col 2 50-54).

Unlike Buckley et al, the one or more components is received over the communication channel, and the conforming of the intermediate output data is based at least in part on the one or more components received over the communication channel not previously stored or installed in the information apparatus.

In accordance with applicant's independent claim 1, the intermediate output data includes image data, and the image data is conformed at least in part with the one or more components received over the communication channel.

Buckley et al discloses that the printer driver "converts the currently opened document into printer data and printer control commands and outputs the printer data and printer control commands...to the currently selected meta printer 300 or 310." See column 7, lines 13-20. Thus, Buckley et al does not disclose or suggest that the general purpose computer 100 supplies intermediate output data, conforming at least in part the content into one or more images based on one or more components received over the communication

channel. Nor does Buckley et al suggest that any component of the printer server 200 or printers 300, 310 receives intermediate output data or sends one or more components based on device the output device.

Claims 6 and 13 have been amended to add means for searching and discovering with short range wireless communication one or more output devices in the vicinity, and means for selecting an output device from among the one or more discovered output devices.

Buckley et al does not disclose or suggest that the general purpose computer 100 or the disclosed UI (FIG. 3, 4, 5, 6) discovers wirelessly an output device in the vicinity. In Buckley et al, each virtual printer or its associated printer model is pre-installed, and stored in the general purpose computer. A user must first install or store specific printer definition (FIG. 2, 132) and a specific printer driver (FIG. 2, 134) in memory component (FIG. 2, 130) in the general purpose computer (FIG. 1, 100). After the printer driver and the printer definition have been installed or stored in the general purpose computer 100, the user can then select a printer or printer model. The selection is not based on discovered output devices. It should be noted that Buckley et al cannot be combined with a prior art discovery process because in Buckley et al the selection of the printer is based on a stored printer driver and a stored printer definition and not based on discovered output device that is not previously stored or installed in the general purpose computer 100.

Independent claim 13 has been further amended to emphasize that, unlike Buckley et al, the standard rasterization parameters are device independent of the selected output device and do not correspond to a specific output device or virtual printer model.

Regarding claim 13, Buckley et al does not disclose or suggest means for conforming at least part of the content into at least one output image with at least one predefined standard rasterization parameter value, the standard rasterization parameter being independent of the selected output device; and means for generating an intermediate output data including the one or more output image, the

intermediate output data being at least partly device independent of the selected output device.

Buckley et al discloses that the printer driver "converts the currently opened document into printer data and printer control commands and outputs the printer data and printer control commands...to the currently selected meta printer 300 or 310." See column 7, lines 13-20. Thus, Buckley et al does not disclose or suggest that the general purpose computer 100 supplies a device independent print data to the printer server 200. The print data generated from the UI accordingly is specific to a specifically user selected and pre-installed virtual printer or virtual printer model.

Referring to Kupka et al, and dependent claims 5, 10, and 17, Kupka et al describes a method of distribution of content over a network infrastructure to which a client user (FIG. 1, 20) can access content in e-commerce server (FIG. 1, 16) over the Internet/WLAN using prepaid media tracking server (FIG. 1, 16) for processing payment. Kupka does not disclose or suggest that the prepaid media can be deducted for payment as a service for data output (e.g. printing) other than for accessing content over the internet. Moreover, referring to FIG. 1 of Kupka et al, the server 16 is connected to WLAN/Internet 12, and the client PC 20 is first connected to local area network 14 then connected to the WLAN/Internet 12. The media tracking server 16 connected to the WLAN/Internet 12 tracks usage of content access for processing payment. Claims 5, 10, and 17 have been amended to emphasize that the communication between the information apparatus and the payment device is through a local short range wireless communication and not through a WLAN/Internet as in Kupka et al.

In view of the foregoing, applicant submits that the invention as defined in the independent claims 1, 6, and 13 is not disclosed or suggested by Buckley et al. Accordingly, claims 1, 6, and 13 are patentable and it follows that the dependent claims also are patentable. Moreover, the features of the amended dependent claims 5, 10 and 17 are not disclosed or suggested by Buckley et al and Kupka et

al whether taken singly or in combination. Accordingly, the dependent claims 5, 10 and 17 are patentable independently of the respective base claims.

Respectfully submitted,



John Smith-Hill

Reg. No. 27,730

SMITH-HILL & BEDELL, P.C.
16100 N.W. Cornell Road, Suite 220
Beaverton, Oregon 97006

Tel. (503) 574-3100
Fax (503) 574-3197
Docket: FLEX 2402